

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
MARIO CASTRO, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:19-cr-00295-GMN-NJK

**ORDER**

(Docket Nos. 291, 292, 295)

Pending before the Court are three motions for status conference. Docket Nos. 291, 292, 295. These motions, like the prior motions that the Court denied, essentially ask the Court to determine the admissibility of certain evidence that the United States may attempt to admit at trial. The motions further pin the determinations of whether one or more defense attorneys will move to withdraw and whether Defendants will request a trial continuance on the admissibility decision. These motions ask the Court for an advisory opinion on whether the evidence will be admitted and on whether the Court will rely on the evidence during the proceedings. Federal courts, however, do not issue advisory opinions. *See Bishop Paiute Tribe v. Inyo County*, 863 F.3d 1144, 1153 (9th Cir. 2017).

When the Court denied the prior motions for status conference, it allowed the parties to file “proper motions as necessary.” Docket No. 288. The current motions, which request an advisory opinion on an admissibility issue, are not proper motions. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the motions for status conference. Docket Nos. 291, 292, 295.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 10, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NANCY J. KOPPE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE